

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

AFFILIATED

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF DAY NURSERIES, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XV, No. 3

BULLETIN

MARCH, 1936

OCT 28 1937

"... we need to use every ethical and legitimate tool we can to make ourselves and our work articulate."—LEON W. FROST

Emergency Nursery Schools—Their Future?

GRACE LANGDON, PH.D.

Specialist, Emergency Nursery Schools, Works Progress Administration

IN the process of social reconstruction, the nursery school has become a vital factor. Prior to the crisis which brought economic want to thousands of homes, *nursery school* meant little if anything to many people. Now, through the experiences of the past two and a half years, these words have come rather generally to signify a certain type of service which, during this period, has been given to needy young children and their parents.

In October of 1933 Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, authorized the establishment of nursery schools as a relief measure in order to restore unemployed persons to socially

useful service, to bring relief to young children from underprivileged homes, and to give help in home care of these children to their parents. Since that time there have been periods when all was not smooth sailing, but through the staunch support of the ever-growing number of persons who recognized the service which the nursery schools could give, they have thus far weathered the gales.

WITHIN a few months of their authorization in 1933 schools were established in 38 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands, serving some

(Continued on page 6)

League Campaign Gathers Momentum

IMPETUS is constantly being gained in the campaign of the Child Welfare League of America for individual members as new cities join those participating. So far, Philadelphia has accomplished the best results. With a goal of \$10,000, it has reported \$8,882, despite the shock and disruption caused by the death of J. Prentice Murphy. The chairman, Albert P. Gerhard, assisted by the national chairman, Francis Biddle, and Edwin D. Solenberger, general secretary of the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, with other agency executives, built an organization that has so far gained more than 340 members and contributors.

Other cities that have recently taken up active work, are Minneapolis and St. Louis. Minneapolis has made excellent progress in spite of the difficulties due to weather conditions. The committee's first meeting was held when the thermometer registered 30 degrees below zero! The evening meeting was

(Continued on page 4)

The Roll of Cooperating Cities

THE first annual meeting of the Child Welfare League of America after the establishment of *individual* memberships will take place next May at the time of the National Conference of Social Work.

Obviously, the League should then report just as large a *number* of members and contributors as it can. But, because of the effect on the League's influence, it should also report the widest possible *geographic distribution* of members.

Every city should be represented; by all means, every city in which there is a member agency.

At the time of the annual meeting, a report will be prepared listing the communities over the country in which there are members and contributors, and showing the number in each.

On this first anniversary we are eager for the name of your community to appear in The Roll of Cooperating Cities.—JACOB KEPECS, President.

Ohio Seeks Suggestions on Protective Work

MRS. MARGUERITE MCCOLLUM

(Mrs. McCollum is director of the Children's Bureau, Canton Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and chairman of the Ohio Committee on Building a Program of Protective Work for Children Into a Community.)

THAT the problem of protective care for children in the community program is a question of moment to all agencies dealing with children was revealed in a recent questionnaire sent out to juvenile courts and to group work and case work agencies in Ohio.

A committee appointed to study the problem found itself lacking an adequate definition upon which to base its discussion. The old term, *protective work*, had meant legal protection against cruelty and neglect, and implied a program of force. Newer philosophies of case work procedure had relegated coercion to a back seat. *Prevention* so frequently substituted itself in the discussion processes that the committee was inclined to feel that "protective work" was a somewhat outmoded term.

The committee discussing the topic used as a guide the White House Conference definition: "Child protection is a specialized service in the field of child welfare in behalf of children suffering from cruelty and abuse, or whose physical, mental or moral welfare is endangered through the neglect of their parents or custodians, or whose personal rights or welfare are violated or threatened by anyone."

MEMBERS of the committee were inclined to quarrel with the statement that "Child protection is a specialized service." Inquiry revealed that a certain amount of protective work was being done in the family agency, the children's agency, the juvenile court, all of the group work agencies, and the child guidance clinic, as well as agencies specifically calling themselves "protective." There was every indication that the responsibility for protective work could not be limited to any one agency.

Family agencies, especially those in the private field, considered themselves responsible for a certain portion of protective work. However, there was an indication that private family agencies were more and more inclined to do a selective job, and, because of the attitude of the public relief agency to eliminate case work, there was an inclination to pass on the residue of cases to the children's agency that would be willing to give protective service to those cases which the family agency did not want or feel

inclined to take. As the majority of juvenile courts had a more or less undefined case load necessarily linked with other social agencies in the community the province of protective work could not be considered ostensibly theirs. All group work carried elements of "protection" but on a "preventive" basis.

There was a general belief that protective service can be most effective when it is integrated into the program of the various agencies dealing with children rather than when it is relegated to any one agency in the community. This, however, brings about a need for some form of coordinating activity in the form of a council of social agencies or a children's council which can place its emphasis on not only allocation of cases but also the developmental angle of a protective program.

There is every indication that the majority of communities are lacking in adequate research and diagnostic equipment as well as case work service to carry on a satisfactory program of protective work. A coordinating council is also highly important at this time because of the security legislation which will make decided changes in the picture of children's work and will have its influence on protective care of children.

The Ohio Committee is still looking about for a new definition of child protection as it pertains to present day social work. It will welcome suggestions.

Protective Work

"CARNAL knowledge cases are the most difficult of all to handle, and require specialized technique in protecting the child from undue court appearance and questioning by unscrupulous attorneys, and, more important still, adjustment and protection for the future.

"While the grosser forms of physical abuse are not so prevalent as they were a decade ago, they still exist in certain communities, and there are other forms of neglect—such as neglect to provide sufficient food and clothing, proper living conditions, needed medical and surgical treatment, or exposing children to immorality and immoral associations."—CHARLES L. BURT, General Agent and Secretary, Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

Child Protection as a Specialized Service

SUSAN K. GILLEAN

Executive Secretary, The Children's Bureau and Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, New Orleans

SOcial case work may well be expected to follow somewhat the same trends as the medical profession in the development of special skills in the various branches of the profession. The general practitioner who still tries to cover the whole field of medicine is apparently becoming lost in the shrubbery. Few people now have the temerity to undertake to cover the entire field of family case work.

Protective case work is one of the highly specialized types of social case work, employing special skills and a special technique. An agency for protective case work accepts complaints regarding children suffering from extreme neglect or cruelty.

In order to understand the problems involved in the complaint, a very careful investigation and analysis of the causes of the neglect or cruelty must be made in every case.

The approach to the client is extremely difficult in this field, and the protective worker must be alert to take advantage of any opportunity that offers to make herself agreeable and useful in order to establish a friendly relationship with her client. Taking children or adults to clinic, providing opportunities for recreation, helping to get the breadwinner certified for W.P.A., these and many other efforts are necessary, nay, imperative, in order to get the family's good will toward an agency visitor who has come as the result of a complaint against the parents. The visitors in our agency are always instructed to approach the parents in a spirit of cooperation for the purpose of removing the cause of the complaint. This attitude generally brings results.

No one believes that a child should be allowed to continue to suffer from extreme neglect. On the other hand, there may be such a strong bond of affection among the members of the family that this emotional relationship almost compensates for the neglect, and a careful case worker hesitates to break the bond of affection. It, therefore, devolves upon the case worker to remove the causes of neglect and strengthen the family feeling, so that the neglected child may remain with his family.

Suppose the investigation discloses a family where the parents are ignorant, have low standards of living, and are unaware of the effects of their method of

living upon their children. These parents probably are very fond of their children, and, when they understand the real purpose of the agency's supervision, they may respond whole-heartedly to the stimulation toward a better standard of living.

On the other hand, some of our clients are so unintelligent and so stolid that only a bench conference or a court hearing can convince them that they have to change their method of living, and then constant and untiring supervision is necessary to keep them at it. It is surprising what fine cooperation sometimes results once the family has recognized the authority of the agency. This recognition of authority seems to be essential, in some instances, in order to get any response.

If both case work methods and juvenile court action fail to accomplish the desired results, then and then only should the children be removed for causes of neglect.

In a case of extreme cruelty, investigation is apt to disclose that one parent is suffering from mental disease or mental defectiveness, or from some great emotional disturbance. Normal parents are rarely very cruel to their children. Since such a family

(Continued on page 7)

Regional Conference in Baltimore

THE Eastern Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America will be held in Baltimore on April 17 and 18, in conjunction with the 75th anniversary celebration of the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society. The conference chairman is Paul T. Beisser, general secretary of the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society, Snow Building, Calvert and Lombard Streets, Baltimore.

\$100,000

In order to maintain and increase its services the Child Welfare League of America is seeking \$100,000 through individual memberships of three types: *Donors*, \$100 and over; *Sustaining*, \$50 to \$99; and *Contributing*, \$5 to \$49. Checks are payable to J. G. Harbord, Treasurer, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 130 E. 22nd St., New York, N. Y.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America and the National Federation of Day Nurseries.

C. C. CARSTENS, Editor
FLORENCE M. PHARO, Assistant Editor

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00 Single copies, 10c.
Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Protecting Children From Cruelty and Neglect

NOTHING arouses a neighborhood more than a parent's abuse of his children. If the situation is serious enough, neighbors, relatives, friends and organizations make it their concern to do something about it.

Most branches of social work with individuals deal with forms of neglect, whether it be slight or flagrant. Strange as it may seem, this fact has often stood in the way of the proper development of effective child protection in that it has created the feeling that no special agency or department is necessary to deal with it. For most forms of neglect and even of cruelty this is true.

It is proper that children's aid societies, juvenile courts, family welfare societies and other agencies should consider most neglect as part of their programs. The more flagrant conditions and the more complicated instances, however, require a careful sifting of hearsay, an evaluation of evidence, and a knowledge of law and the ability to use it. Child protection in flagrant cases demands special skill and experience in order that the attempt of rendering such protection may not become abortive. The child must be given a happier life and a better adjustment because of this effort.

An instance that comes to my mind is that of a girl whose mother was conducting houses of prostitution along an entire coast of the United States. The mother had sent the child away from "home" to live with a friend—in one of the most disreputable streets of another city. Through the services of a protective agency, and various other organizations, the child was placed in a good boarding home, and she is now a college graduate, holding an important position in the business world. This could not have been accomplished without a high degree of skill as the

mother had both funds and powerful influence to fight in the courts for guardianship. Years later, the mother admitted that her idea of "protecting" the girl had fallen short, and she expressed appreciation of what had been done for her child.

Protection of children is at foundation more definitely a public than a private function. If the law is invoked, it is done under the police power of the state. Juvenile and other courts are charged with the responsibility of hearing cases involving child protection, but often they must stop with the punishment of the offender, or, when authority goes beyond, are unable because of limitations of staff to provide the social service required for making an adequate adjustment for the child. Even the children's protective agencies, in certain instances, have been known to be more concerned with *conviction* than *protection*.

In order that cruelty and neglect may not become flagrant, or may be prevented, an early approach is necessary, but knowledge regarding the conditions rarely comes to the court before they have become serious. City, county and state departments of public welfare are agencies that seem more logically suited to undertake the work. They are, however, at present rarely equipped with adequate staff even for relief and for child care—and equipment for child protection evidently awaits a fuller realization of the community's responsibility, even when authority for it is vested in these departments. Until better provision is made by the public agencies, the work still falls within the scope of private societies.

It is to be hoped that in the movement for the development of broader welfare functions on the part of the public the flagrant conditions in child protection may be included, and that state, county and city departments may become equipped with skilled staff to build up better family life where intervention for child protection seems necessary.

—C. C. CARSTENS

League Campaign Gathers Momentum

(Continued from page 1)

attended by a representative group of over 100, though it took place on the night of the worst blizzard of the year.

Thomas Wallace, president of the Farmers and Mechanics Savings Bank, the chairman, and Miss Caroline M. Crosby, vice-chairman, assisted by Miss Elsa Castendyck, executive secretary of the Washburn Home, have already enabled Minneapolis to

approach its goal. The evening meeting on February 8 in Minneapolis was addressed by Miss Grace Abbott, former chief of the U. S. Children's Bureau, and Louis E. Evans, division director, Children's and Minor's Service Division, Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, Chicago.

In St. Louis, under the energetic leadership of Mrs. Norris Allen, chairman, and with the help of Mrs. Max Myer and Herschel Alt, general secretary of the St. Louis Children's Aid Society, a number of new friends have been won for the League, and memberships and contributions received.

Even in the cities that began work early in the winter, committees are continuing to send in memberships and contributions. Among such cities is Rochester, where Mrs. Fannie R. Bigelow is chairman, assisted by Oscar Kuolt, director of the Council of Social Agencies, and Whitcomb H. Allen, superintendent of the Rochester Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

In Indianapolis, Miss Gertrude Taggart, the chairman, who is also a member of the League's board of directors, is determined that the city shall reach its goal. Likewise, memberships are still coming in from Cincinnati, where Troy W. Appleby, president of the Ohio National Life Insurance Company, is chairman, with Eric W. Gibberd and James E. Stuart, of the Council of Social Agencies, Miss Mary A. Connell, executive secretary of the Ohio Humane Society, and John Bayne Ascham, superintendent of the Children's Home, assisting him.

CHICAGO started its campaign the latter part of February under the leadership of Carroll H. Sudler, prominent business man, a former president and member for many years of the board of directors of the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society. A Chicago committee has been appointed. With it are working Jacob Kepecs, president of the League and superintendent of the Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago, C. V. Williams, superintendent of the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, and Miss Ethel Verry, executive secretary of the Chicago Orphan Asylum.

The Chicago committee held a meeting on February 24 which was attended by representatives of 19 of the organizations in Chicago working for children. Mr. Sudler, the chairman, presided. The speakers included C. W. Areson, assistant executive director of the League, Jacob Kepecs, C. V. Williams and Miss Verry. The greatest interest was manifested in the League program. The meeting has resulted in additional organizations seeking member-

ship as well as in our obtaining new individual members.

Boston has its first meeting on March 19. Alfred F. Whitman, executive secretary of the Children's Aid Association, and Cheney C. Jones, superintendent of the New England Home for Little Wanderers, are bringing together board members and executives of children's organizations throughout New England.

A number of smaller meetings have been held in New York City as well as in Westchester County. Several more are planned for this month and next.

Campaigns in Washington, D. C., and in St. Paul are scheduled to take place in April. In the former city we have Mrs. Eugene Meyer as leader. With her are working Elwood Street, director of the Board of Public Welfare, and Mrs. W. A. Roberts, executive secretary of the Washington Council of Social Agencies. In St. Paul, Miss Gertrude Cammack, executive secretary of the Ramsey County Child Welfare Board, is acting chairman. Pierce Atwater, head of the Community Chest, is working with her.

SOME smaller cities are carrying on campaigns or definitely planning programs for the early future. Memberships are coming in from Toledo as a result of the cooperation of Mrs. W. Sinclair Walbridge and Wendell F. Johnson, director of the Social Service Federation. Mrs. Luetta Magruder, of the Department of Public Welfare, is the League's active leader in Columbus.

Miss Irene Lamkin, director of the Children's Service Bureau, is inducing citizens of Charlotte, North Carolina, to become members.

Others of the smaller cities that are definitely planning to cooperate with the League include Providence, where Miss Matty L. Beattie, executive secretary of the Rhode Island Children's Friend Society, and Charles L. Burt, general secretary of the Rhode Island S.P.C.C., are seeking an early conference with Mr. Areson to determine the program; Hartford, where Kenneth L. Messenger, deputy commissioner of the Division of Child Welfare, and Henry R. Murphy, executive secretary of the Connecticut Children's Aid Society, are caring for the League's interests; New Haven, where Maurice R. Davie, president of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association, Byron T. Hacker, director of the Children's Community Center, and Mrs. Edith Valet Cook, executive secretary of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association, are at work; Harrisburg, where Mrs. Lenore Stone Meffley, executive secretary of the Associated Aid Societies is taking steps to or-

ganize a committee; Dover, Delaware, where Miss Elsie Lee Spring, associate secretary of the State Board of Charities, is cooperating so that the League will have some members in Dover.

The new members of the League are not limited to these cities, however. Memberships are coming from various parts of the country—California, Florida, Kansas, Georgia, and elsewhere.

In addition to its other activities, the League is seeking to obtain support of its program from foundations and special funds throughout the country. Special presentations have already been made to several of these. While in some cases they have indicated that they are not able to help, in others it is evident that they are giving most careful consideration to the possibility of their lending support.

Emergency Nursery Schools—Their Future?

(Continued from page 1)

65,000 children two to four years of age and their parents. During the summer of 1934, when it became evident that the program would continue, selections were made of those nursery schools serving the greatest need; and during 1934-1935, though the total number operating was materially reduced, several additional states launched programs. During 1934 there were 1,913 nursery schools operating in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, serving a total of 76,406 children and their parents, and employing approximately 6,770 persons on the staffs.

Probably the greatest difficulty confronting the program at any time occurred in the fall of 1935, coincident with unavoidable delays in the transfer from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to the Works Progress Administration. As every conceivable type of organization came forward with the help that would tide over the emergency and make it possible for the nursery schools to continue an unbroken service, the difficulty served to show how firmly many people had come to believe that the nursery school could perform a socially useful service.

In the interval occasioned by the transfer when details were being worked out whereby funds for food could be made available, tradespeople carried the accounts, and organizations and private individuals gave funds for the purchase of food, that the schools might go on. When unavoidable delay in approval of projects left the nursery schools without

cooks and janitors, parents and volunteer workers from various organizations filled the gap.

The program is now fully under way in 46 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and a few nursery schools will reopen in the 47th state within a short time. All told, there are now (as of March 1, 1936) about 1,500 emergency nursery schools in operation, with probably about 45,000 enrolled. Many of the states that have not been able to reopen all the schools they had last year plan to do so within the next few weeks.

On every hand one meets the question: What is to become of these emergency nursery schools, and how can their service be kept? Many people have come to believe that the nursery school has a unique social service to perform.

It is frequently pointed out that the nursery school is not and never should be a *home substitute*, but that the school is and should be, rather, a *home supplement*, making it possible, by cooperative effort between home and nursery school, to bring to young children an ever-broadening opportunity for rich and abundant living.

The nursery school safeguards the physical health of the children, and makes possible the early detection and correction of physical difficulties. It provides for a breadth of experience which few homes can offer, by giving contacts with a wide variety of materials as well as with children of similar ages. Through guidance of these social contacts, a child has the opportunity to learn the principles of behavior which are fundamental to social living. The nursery school also safeguards mental health, helping the child—through experiences with others of his own age—to learn his rightful place in the world. It makes the early detection of behavior difficulties possible, and, through guidance to more socially useful responses, may conceivably contribute to reduction of later juvenile delinquency.

It contributes to the mental health of parents, as well as of children, relieving the strain of constant care of and companionship with the child. For the *conscientious* parent it helps to allay anxiety incident to giving care for which many times lack of training has left the parent unprepared. For the *indifferent* parent it often stimulates an interest leading to the assumption of the responsibility rightfully his. Through such services the nursery school functions as an agency for social betterment.

The possible scope of that function for various levels of society remains to be more fully explored. Already one hears it suggested that services already

demonstrated be made available, like all other educational opportunity, to all the children of all the people. During the two and a half years of the emergency program, various organizations throughout the United States interested in child care, welfare, and educational guidance have utilized many different means for keeping the public informed concerning both the services and the needs of the emergency nursery schools. Through press, radio, personal contact and public addresses, attention has been called to the needs of young children as a public responsibility. Facts have been made available to the public, indicating what constitutes suitable care and guidance for young children.

During the emergency, great strides have been made in the coordination of efforts on the part of all types of organizations for the betterment of child life. The nursery school is one agency which has contributed in some degree to that betterment. It remains to broaden and deepen that contribution, and to so interrelate its services with that of other agencies that increasingly more children may benefit more fully.

Child Protection as a Specialized Service

(Continued from page 3)

situation is fraught with danger, a protective agency generally removes the child temporarily until psychiatric diagnosis and treatment have resulted in the removal of the mentally ill patient, or the improvement of the conditions so that the child may return to his home.

Children removed from situations of extreme neglect or cruelty not only need medical care and habit training, et cetera, but they are generally in need of psychiatric treatment themselves, since they have suffered from such abnormal experiences, and foster mothers must be chosen who are skillful and patient in caring for such problems. For this reason it is better for the protective agency to conduct a special foster home project for neglected and mistreated children.

THE problems of the neglected child are also the problems of his family since children do not neglect themselves, and much better coordinated treatment results if the agency dealing with the child also has responsibility for re-educating his parents; hence, the all-round case work service provided by a good protective agency.

The difference between these cases and the cases referred to the family welfare society are as follows:

1. Family welfare agencies are interested in dealing with persons and families who really desire helpful treatment, while the vast majority of the families coming to the attention of a protective agency do not seek treatment and do not respond to treatment with much enthusiasm until they are convinced that the visitor can be helpful.

2. Because of the type of the family coming to a protective agency, ordinary case work methods do not always prove effective, and special skill in approach and in rendering service must be used. A bench conference or juvenile court action may become necessary to secure any kind of cooperation from parents who must recognize authority.

In order to provide protective case work of a high standard it is necessary that a protective agency have a staff of trained and experienced case workers, skilled in approach to difficult situations and personalities; quick to seize opportunities for ingratiating themselves in the good graces of the client without in any way yielding their standards of child-care; informed in legal procedure for the protection of children and for punishment of adult offenders against children, in juvenile court procedure, and in procedure for the commitment of the feeble-minded and the insane; and they must be able to wangle in and out of the political entanglements surrounding court action. They must be alert to make use of every available community resource for children and adults, and have sufficient training in psychiatric method to be able to cooperate with the child guidance clinic.

In addition to this varied assortment of abilities and skills, the protective case worker must be able to select good foster mothers who will give to neglected children enough thoughtful care to become substitute mothers as well as habit trainers and character builders, and then the protective worker must be able to advise the foster mother how to deal with all the minor problems of child care!

It's a large order!!!

Tithes

"... in these hard years we have learned more discrimination in giving and we have learned the value of trained social service to help us discriminate."—MARY L. LANGWORTHY, President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Wayward Youth

WAYWARD YOUTH, by August Aichhorn. Viking Press, New York, 1935. 236 pages. \$2.75.

THIS book has interest for all child welfare workers. While the discussion emphasizes the delinquent and "problem" child, much can be gained from it in the understanding of all children.

One has only to look at the author's picture to catch something of his genial personality, and of his appeal to youngsters. He writes of his experience as former director of an institution for children, as an adviser of a city child welfare department, and as present director of the Child Guidance Clinic of Vienna. The book reflects the depth of his understanding, and the years of preparation that have gone into his background.

He thinks of work with delinquents as a process of re-education. He emphasizes the importance of the first contact, of quickly sizing up the individual, and of varying treatment to meet the individual need. The relationship between the worker and child is of vital importance.

Aichhorn recognizes the importance of the unconscious, and that the child may not know why he has done a particular thing. The worker, therefore, must have understanding, and must approach the problem with no preconceived ideas. Every situation allows for wide interpretation. He wisely states, "I do not regard every unusual bit of behavior as springing from some obscure motive, but try first to find a simple explanation." The importance of early childhood experiences is vividly portrayed through his well selected illustrations. Here is a challenge for *prevention* for all those having direct contact with children. We get a clear picture of the effects on the child of too little affection, and also of an overdose of affection. We see the futility of treating symptoms without an understanding of motivating causes.

The chapter on the "aggressive group" is fascinating. Grouping of the children in this institution was considered of great importance, and after certain trial placements a fairly homogeneous grouping was achieved. However, after this occurred there were twelve boys not tolerated in any group. It is with these youngsters that this chapter deals. After a brief description of these boys, Aichhorn gives us something of his method (pages 172-173):

"First we had to compensate for this great lack of love and then gradually and with great caution begin to make demands upon the children. Severity

would have failed completely. Our treatment of this group could be characterized thus: a consistently friendly attitude, wholesome occupation, plenty of play to prevent aggression, and repeated talks with the individual members. No pressure that could be avoided was brought to bear on them. For instance, if a boy wanted to do something outside of the group activity of the moment, he was allowed to do so without question; or if he did not wish to eat at the table, he could take his food into the play room and sit in the corner; or if he did not like the play that was going on, he could break off. Of necessity there were regular hours for getting up, going to bed, meals, games, and so on. However, these were not binding on the individual. Our motto was: as far as possible, let the boys alone. The workers were to maintain their self-control however excessive the conduct became. They intervened in fights and brawls only to prevent injuries, without taking sides in the altercation."

This quotation illustrates how much of process is given in the book. As one student remarked, it is as if Aichhorn anticipated your questions and proceeded to give a simple, practical explanation.

The stories and the discussion are so readable that it is difficult to put the book aside before completion. One wants it for reference to return to again and again.—MAUD MORLOCK, Director, Course in Child Welfare, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

National Conference, May 24-30

THE League has a limited supply of reduced railway certificates for use in travel to Atlantic City, and will be glad to issue them upon request to League member agencies that are not members of the Conference. Conference members should secure certificates direct from the National Conference of Social Work, 82 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio.

New League Member Agency

NEW YORK—Dobbs Ferry: St. Christopher's School. Miss Lou-Eva Longan, Superintendent. Inter-society service agreement: Article 1, New York; Articles 2 and 3, Westchester County, within a radius of twenty miles from Dobbs Ferry in any direction.

League Directory Change

OHIO—Canton: Catholic Community League. New address, 609 Cleveland Ave., N. W.

Enclosure

(Sent to League Member Agencies Only)

STRANDED CHILDREN, editorial by Francis Biddle, National Campaign Chairman, Child Welfare League of America. One-page reproduction from the National Parent-Teacher Magazine, March, 1936.